

Winter 1959

Quo Vadimus in Criminological Training

Samuel Haig Jameson

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarlycommons.law.northwestern.edu/jclc>

 Part of the [Criminal Law Commons](#), [Criminology Commons](#), and the [Criminology and Criminal Justice Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Samuel Haig Jameson, Quo Vadimus in Criminological Training, 50 J. Crim. L. & Criminology 358 (1959-1960)

This Criminal Law is brought to you for free and open access by Northwestern University School of Law Scholarly Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology by an authorized editor of Northwestern University School of Law Scholarly Commons.

QUO VADIMUS IN CRIMINOLOGICAL TRAINING?¹

SAMUEL HAIG JAMESON

The author is Lecturer in Criminology and Juvenile Delinquency in the School of Public Administration and Delinquency Control Institute in the University of Southern California. He has been Professor of Sociology in the University of Oregon (1930-1946) and Director of Research in the California Intelligence Bureau (1946-1949).

In June of the present year Dr. Jameson began serving on a two year's assignment in Brazil with the International Coordination Administration.

The following article was delivered as an address before the fifteenth annual conference of the American Society of Criminology at Tucson on February 1, 1959—EDITOR.

I. INTRODUCTION

Those accustomed to worship at the altar of statistics contend that the rate of crime in the United States is still on the rise. Apparently we have become a nation of thieves and robbers, rapists and addicts. Our jails are packed, courts are behind in their calendar, prisons overcrowded, probation and parole officers overloaded, and the public overawed. Meanwhile the rest of the world looks to us with expectations as the leaders of "modern penology". Our prisons set the pace for the humane treatment of their wards; our probation and parole workers probe into overt life histories; and the psychiatrists penetrate behind the concrete walls of the mind into the realm of the unconscious. Our ingenuity to turn the inside out and the outside in again, is matchless.

Today we are somewhat confused, frustrated, groping and, at times, irrational. True, the old trigger-happy gun-guard in the tower has been displaced by the trained "sociologist" at the Guidance Centers; the chain-gangs are transformed into industrial and trade trainees within the prison walls; and the re-conditioned erring culprits released into this blooming and buzzing world for

¹ Students who may be interested in pursuing Professor Jameson's subject matter further would do well to read our series under the general title, "Pioneers in Criminology." The first of the series was published in our Volume 45, number 1, May-June, 1954. Others are distributed in subsequent volumes. Numerous additional appropriate readings in this connection which will indicate the directions in which criminology seems to be tending.

And our forthcoming Volume 51, which will commemorate the completion of the first 50 years of this JOURNAL'S history will be marked by many distinguished criminologists who have been invited to contribute their evaluations of criminology as it stands today in numerous corners of the total area—EDITOR.

rehabilitation. We have traveled a long and rough road because of that glimmering faith in daring to do something against the custodial collective psychosis. But all this only *after* the commission of the anti-social act. Meanwhile, religious, political, economic, even educational vested interests have militated against efforts to show "our faith through our works".

Undoubtedly our views are colored by our milieu. As an academic trainer in this process of enlightenment, let me be blunt: As yet we do not have a profession of criminology; what we pride ourselves in is a galaxy of competitive occupations with conflicting and hostile ideologies. Yet we would not have gathered here without a belief common to all, namely, the restorability of society's erring members, nor would we be here unless convinced of the probability of preventing potential anti-social behavior.

Early criminology and penology, imbued with the custodial psychosis, and the modern era intoxicated with the reform virus, approached their subject matter after the criminal act was committed. The Geneva Conference on Crime is a living witness. Its concern with the six areas in the handling of the crime situation so familiar to you were: Minimum rules for treatment of prisoners; open institutions; prison labor; personnel; Juvenile Delinquency; and the sentencing methods. Each one of these deals with situations after the commission of the anti-social act. They are valid facets of the total crime picture but not quite inclusive of all the facets. What is missing? Investigations of the criminogenic factors and their control. This means that attention should be focused upon the before the act instead of the current practice of after the act. What to do to prevent the occurrence of the undesirable act and

not only how to deal with the actor after he has committed the act is my theme.

II. MEANDERINGS IN CRIMINOLOGY

The future path of Criminology is bent by its past and the present. One cannot say that criminology's meandering scenery has been uninteresting or totally barren. Religious, legalistic, reformistic, heuristic explanations and remedies expounded in literature from the Code of Hammurabi to the current legislation recommending the abolition of capital punishment, offer hair-raising, artful and shifty documentaries. But none of the past attitudes equal the handicap which the paradox of our contemporary American John Q. Public displays.

The nostrum of well-meaning citizens' choruses echo throughout the land: "Why doesn't government do something?" "What are these scientists doing about crime?" "How long will this mollycoddling of criminals by the probation and parole officers continue?" "What has come upon our judges? Don't they believe in protecting society's Rights?" "What's this indeterminate sentence which makes imprisonment a joke?" "Why have the prisons become social clubs?" "How long will the taxpayers be expected to bear the burden?" "It is time that somebody did something instead of talking about it". "Let's do something. . ."

"Let's do something". But we are accustomed to delegate functions to other agencies. We expect the fire department to put out the fire; the police to apprehend the arsonist, the judge to sentence him, the custodial institutions to punish him, the parole officer to supervise his behavior for a while, etc. These are necessary because John, Dick and Harry, Jane, Helen and Mary have neither the time nor the equipment to do anything with and for the arsonist. All they can do is scream against arson and get assurance from the law enforcement agencies that he is "locked up" and that the public is safe for the time being.

"Let's do something"? Something was done. What did the screaming citizens do? An apathetic, uninformed, agitated citizenry fanned the fires of hostility against the arsonist while fearing arson in the future. It asked severe punishment for the act; the judge's severe sentence evened the score. There stopped public's interest. Whether the firebug commits suicide in prison because of guilt feeling, or the institution, after administering psychiatric treatment, "cures" and returns him to society, is

no concern of the average citizen. The paradox may be spelled out: People are interested in the act and not in the actor. In depraved cases, interest in the actor ends with his probable liquidation or permanent incarceration in a penal institution. Our unholy fear of convicts contributes to the stabilization of the heightened hostility. A public with such retributive philosophy and punishment cannot offer much help to those suffering from a guilt complex. And our law enforcement and correctional personnel are recruited from the rank and file of such a public.

III. EVIDENCES OF FOREWARD MARCH

To the chorus of "let's do something", our choir responds: "We have done much, and are doing more".

Remember the abolition of the lash in Florida, control by terror and beatings in Montana, emergence of the mobile County Circuit Courts, Detention Homes, Youth Aid Divisions of Police Departments, Juvenile Courts, minimum security prisons, reception and guidance centers, probation and parole, special treatment of sex psychopaths and the emotionally disturbed, inmate education, group therapy, forestry camps, indefinite sentence, residential treatment, and a host of others so familiar to you.

Whereas the objective of these constructive measures is the restoration of the offender to respectability in his civilian milieu, still they are geared to the grinding concept of punishment and retribution. Apparently faith in complete redemption is to be found only in the religious sphere. Maximum security remains the fundamental concern of our prisons, and those of who peddle rehabilitation in the name of the "New Criminology", do so with tongue in cheek. Key to resolute faith is self-discipline which can be induced only through the creation of insight of the role self plays in the social milieu.

IV. LOOKING AHEAD

In as much as this conference program focuses attention on the training of the "cops" (I hope this includes the flat feet!), military and civilian correctional services, probation and parole workers, I should avoid stepping on such sacred soils. But this pasture is so green that permit me to yield to the temptation briefly since sinning is such great fun!

Avoiding the administration of potent shots in

the arm and the prescription of a wonder drug, let me stress the necessity of a balanced nutritional diet in criminological training.

Without an analysis of the job to be done it would be superfluous to talk about training. Assuming that our ultimate objective is to socialize the anti-social, to adjust the maladjusted, and to alter potent liabilities into actual assets, (thus preventing the recurrence of noxious social behavior) Criminological training has been following two courses: Common sense and Scientific objectivity. In the future it is not going to carve a new path.

1. COMMON SENSE CHANNELS

Social action enthusiasts are pushing criminological training into practical channels. Businessmen, housewives, school teachers, lawyers, physicians, ministers, laborers and politicians, with an eye on quick results, have compromised with the facts of life and their conscience. While professing the sacredness of the human life, they have hanged and electrocuted; while preaching forgiveness, hysterically they have objected to pardons; while advocating reformation, they have persecuted and punished; while vociferous against petty crimes, they have closed their eyes to gigantic frauds; while the judges order social investigations, they keep on sentencing with their preconceived personal biases; and whereas the efficacy of extramural treatment is acknowledged, both the public and the correctional administrators still plan for bigger maximum security institutions!

These current compromises strengthen the belief in the efficacy of the trial-and-error methods of training. Experience is taken as the supreme teacher in which the "do-gooders", "know-not-howers", and the "breast-beaters" find solace. Training-on-the-job and inservice methods help the situation somewhat, but all in all action is slanted by wishful thinking. Hence, criminological training is moving more and more in the direction of *skills* and *social fads* rather than knowledge and social control.

2. SCIENTIFIC OBJECTIVITY

In contrast with the massive action-maniac segment of our society, there is a small, cautious, but persistent band of *tested knowledge* addicts. By tested knowledge we do not mean theoretical speculation; it is empirical as well. The utilization of atomic energy emerged from a fund of pre-

viously proven knowledge. Hypotheses become concrete applications both in academic and non-academic circles. Thus our program is geared to academic and pragmatic techniques of training and our speakers and panelists will herald their convictions based on observation and knowledge.

Increased and sound scientific orientation of those engaged in the professional handling of criminals is a *must*. Academic inculcation of some principles as first step in training is taken for granted. Like the pre-med or the pre-law, engineering or education majors, each is expected to be grounded in basic principles. Although the knowledge of principles is essential, no principle per se has healed the suffering sick, built bridges or transferred wisdom to the uninitiated students. Principles become concrete acts only when human beings apply them to specific situations. Formal training may sharpen the insight, but a single bitter experience in the university of hard knocks may dull it permanently. Current watertight intellectual compartmentalism in institutions of higher learning encourages insulation, causing thought stagnation. Premature specializations, so common in secondary schools, Junior and four year colleges, accentuate the processes of this insulation. These practices may teach technical skills, but they increase mental astigmatism blurring the vision because of limited horizons.

Workers in the correctional field, in any capacity, are expected to be *human engineers*. The edifices they build are men and women within their social frame of reference. Theirs is the task of molding and remolding personalities acceptable by the standards of the dominant groups. But how would one dare to reshape a deviant personality unless he knows the image of his society? And if the image of his society itself is distorted, what is the worker's role? Is it to redistort the deviant? Such questions shall constitute the essence of the training programs of the future.

As an academician it would be treason not to advocate grounding of all workers in the basic contributions of the physical and the social sciences. In spite of overspecialization, the age of interdisciplinary orientation is upon us, and to ignore its beckoning would ultimately destroy the delusively self-confident specialists. The wider the range of knowledge the greater the prospect of tested principles and sound applications in the field of crime and corrections. Our workers need orientation in genetics and psychology, physiology

and economics, anthropology and political science, statistics and, I might add, sociology, to become effective human engineers. These are academic vested interests—and there are many others—guarding their respective citadels zealously, every day and in devious ways building barriers against possible encroachments by others, wasting resources on testing knowledge which has been already tested and proven by others, and dubbing it “research”! Our future successes lie in coordination, in integration of any and every proven principle in the handling of man whether they come from the ivory towers or the gutter colleges.

I should not labor the implications of this simple yet crucial issue. Speakers and discussants today and tomorrow will whet your and my appetite, I am sure. Therefore, let me pass on to the consideration of a hitherto neglected area of criminological training: The great unwashed.

V. TRAINING OF THE MASSES

The education of “cops”, probation and parole workers, district attorneys, judges, prosecutors, chiefs of police, wardens, supervisors, guidance center technicians, clinicians, guards and counselors, even that of the executioners, have absorbed most of the attention of the academicians and on-the-job trainers. Criminology would have made no strides without due emphasis upon the preparation of these “professionals” who constitute the core of our crimino-penal system and in whose work you are directly involved. My concern is the orientation of the great unwashed in the periphery whose unavoidable impacts either stimulate or curb our cherished programs.

In our democratic social structure voters are kings. Their verdict at the ballot box, and subsequently the acts of their representatives, determine the rules of the social game. The future of crimino-penal trends is bound up with the climate of public opinion.

Housewives with their beliefs in old tales; businessmen with their blind or enlightened selfish interests; men of the cloth wrapped up in their heuristic beliefs; school teachers confined to the rote of the three Rs; journalists and other operators of media of mass communication with their drive for the spectacular; lawyers with the urge to settle disputes, (right or wrong); psychologists, psychoanalysts and psychiatrists with their personalized conjectures; incensed taxpayers, power infatuated labor organizers, charlatans and

scientists alike dictate, directly or subtly, social values, and shape attitudes which insure their perpetuation. Through political representatives in local, state and national government levels, these color, to say the least, and set the tone and the pace of criminological thinking. Irrespective of all the tested knowledge by students in the field, a half-baked, and at times a raw statement by J. Edgar Hoover in the Readers Digest carries more weight than one hundred research articles in the *Journal of Criminal Law, Criminology and Police Science*.

Who trains these helpless souls, who prompted by marked curiosity, devour the pages of daily newspapers with sordid accounts of crime? Who is educating the millions in our midst seeking vicarious satisfactions through the two-bit novels? Who is imparting instruction to men and women who make a business of frauds, bankruptcies, vice and depravities? These organized and inchoate interests exert their pressures in ingenious ways to dispirit and dissuade realistic attacks upon criminal behavior and penology. Some because of ignorance, others by design, encourage anti-social acts. These too need training, perhaps not within the walls of ivy leagues, but in the highway and the byways of daily mass media orientation.

Who is bringing the results of tested knowledge to peoples' attention regarding the concept of multiple causation of crime; the reasons for high rate of recidivism; the ineffectiveness of severity of punishment; the irrationality of penitentiary treatment; the savagery of retribution; the innocuousness of capital punishment, etc? We talk about these seamy facets of our profession among ourselves—the believers. Even if there be a consensus of opinion within our sacrosanct circles, who is preaching the gospel to the infidels? How are we endeavoring to change the deeply ingrained retributive complex to a remorse stricken folk and turn people from the punishment craze to sober prevention? Public's orientation in these areas may create a duller social climate for us to work in, but it promises some reduction in the rate of antisocial behavior and sadistic vengeance.

Here is a long overlooked task for those engaged in law enforcement who deal with the offenders and the public. People watch our utterances and movements with suspicion. A knock at the door by the police, sheriff's car in the street, probation officers' untimely visit, a phone call from the jail, a letter from the warden inspire fear. The news-

papers fan these smouldering feelings to the extent of creating hostilities against the law enforcement personnel. Hence opportunity for the emergence of a new breed of workers, social lubricants, to allay the fears and sell law enforcement and corrections to the public. You call this "Public Relations". Under any name this is a must. If we have anything to brag about because of the demonstrable salutary results we have achieved, it is high time to publish them, otherwise we shall perish from the wear and tear of constant social friction.

Not all is well when some irresponsible officer or an agency behaves unprofessionally; neither is it all well when a new idea, technique or law is advanced against the outworn beliefs. The education of the masses calls for the work of skilled technicians in human engineering. Who and where are we training these social engineers? Who and how are they influencing public opinion? (We may get some answers from the panelists tomorrow!)

VI. OBSERVATIONS AND ADMONITIONS

No matter through what medium, learning is a great adventure. The ventilation of watertight intellectual and behavioral compartments comes through new exposures. It is apparent that traditionally skills imparted to the practioners are fixed. Repetition is expected to increase efficiency. This is true in a static social structure. Unfortunately we live in a dynamic milieu and we take pride in it. Spelled out, we have either to sharpen our dulled tools or else acquire new tools.

Whether these tools in dealing with the anti-social segments of our society come from the academic circles or through the in-service and on-the-job training quarters, the "old order passeth away and the new is ushered in". That both the academician and the practitioner are inclined to stratification is a matter of record. Therefore, as the collegiate faculties are granted sabbaticals to get out of their cocoons and see the bright sun for a spell, so do the correctional workers and the law enforcement personnel of every grade and discription, need the opportunity to see the other side. Should a periodic three, or six, or nine months of academic atmosphere to the practitioner be mandatory? Should a similar chance be given to the academician in reverse? Such experiences might have some chastening effects. Our forth-

coming discussion on "short-cut" methods of training should confirm the rationale of this issue.

Assuming that change for the balancing of the academic and the pragmatic training is made available to the personnel, the question as to the content of training becomes of paramount importance.

Apeing the laboratory technique of the physical sciences, certain social scientists have resorted to the use of the "clinical" method. Hypotheses are spurned unless they are clinically tested. Some possessed by the clinic-craze, have popularized the "couch" technique in the revered sanctum of the analyst. Do behavior explosions in the private repeat themselves in public? Can criminal behavior, controlled in a clinical setting be expected to become a constant pattern in a non-clinical milieu? Would the composure and insight gained on the couch withstand the stresses and the strains imposed upon the compulsive criminal by a heartless and hostile public? How is the excon's self-confidence while leaning upon the sympathetic, understanding and helpful approach of the parole officer going to fare in the midst of perpetual surveillance of the suspicious law enforcement officers? Would the authority-mad and status-hungry officials exploit the ex-con's predicament for personal gain?

As we search the fields we operate in, one observes the prevalence of status-starvation. Desirable status, the most cherished possession of every human being living in an organized society, if denied, causes frustration beyond measure, therefore it is fraught with disaster. How much awareness of this socially imposed compulsive drive is being imparted to those handling their wards? How do we equip our officers on the beat and the workers in correctional institutions to ascertain the nature and the degree of group affiliations and identifications in the incidence of anti-social behavior? Are the skills gained in detection, apprehension, submission, incarceration and liquidation of offenders related to the control and prediction of future behavior? What type and intensity of knowledge is to be infused into the life of practitioners? What tools are to be devised by the theoretician for pragmatic application? What systems of fluid communication lines could we initiate to get quick results? Or are we going to keep on deluding ourselves by finding refuge behind incompatible statistical charts and tables? We need objective answers to these ques-

tions to combat the do-gooder detergents in our social washtub.

Obviously the criminological training program of the future will emphasize some division of labor among its advocates: 1) Diagnosticians to delve into the causative factors in anti-social behavior. These are the "research" people whose hunches are to be verified for consumption by the rest of us. 2) Practitioners to execute the revelations of the researchers. These constitute a heterogeneous mass, ranging from the fingerprinting specialists to the vice squad personnel, from the traffic officer to the Chief of Police, from the probation and parole workers to wardens and superintendents of correctional institutions. 3) Prognosticians and therapists to attend to the needs of folks who display symptoms of anti-social behavior. These range from counseling pastors to the super-snooping analysts and from social surveyors to political planners.

For the conditioning of this extensive galaxy of personnel the existing channels are bound to continue. These include formal academic courses with specific objectives; in-service indoctrinations; on-the-job apprenticeships; brief institutes; instructive and constructive public lectures, etc.

These techniques will prevail with one overall emphasis: Widened mental horizons for each and every person engaged in law enforcement and correctional fields. Since a man's judgment is never better than his information, the more catholic the orientation the greater is the prospect for balanced judgment. Whatever the source of information (particularly verified information), the airing of the mind and the cleansing of personal biases are indispensable requisites in criminological training.

Finally, do I need to remind this group that, according to reports released by the Federal Bureau of Investigation, over 60 percent of criminals had previous records? If this is true, every phase of law enforcement and corrections has to re-deal with these repeaters. Is their *modus operandi* information in the files revealing enough to offer an adequate profile of character analysis? Do we dare "underwrite character"? Of course. But should we in our attempts to recondition, stress character-building? If character underwriting is a post-crime phenomenon, could we develop character to obviate the commission of the crime? Who is going to open our sails in this uncharted realm, and how?

VII. CONCLUSION

Today criminological training is headed in one direction with two separate rails of the track. On the academic level it aspires to become objective in analyzing the criminal as a person and ascertaining the contributing factors to his anti-social behavior. Daily its probings are becoming more and more intricate and the findings less and less definitive. On the practitioner's level, grassroots resistance to humane treatment of the offender and insistence upon retribution, contribute to the mounting confusions and frustrations. Under these circumstances no great forward leap in criminology should be expected.

Our knowledge is widening as well as deepening, but the diffusion of this knowledge among the regimented practitioners and traditionally disaffected public is only dribbling. *Quo vadimus?* We are moving towards the promised land, but still sojourning in the wilderness of fears and clouds of aspiration. We are still the cave-men in a technological civilization. Our past record in dealing with the criminal is shrouded with compromises. The sacred and the secular have exerted their impacts upon each other, modifying beliefs and behavior here and there. Old superstitions linger. Neither the academicians nor the practitioners seem capable of shaking off outworn notions. And so long as the materialistic success goal is overemphasized, irrespective of the means employed in reaching that goal, personal and collective anti-social behavior will thrive.

An overhauling of our current way of life in dealing with the anti-social elements of our system is in order. This is a task for the academic criminologists. We look to them for direction and guidance.

With proper channels of communication, the law enforcement agencies, because of their direct contact with the offender, will serve as social lubricants between the experimenting academicians and the expectant public.

When we turn the searchlight upon our doings in the academic halls, in periodic institutes, in the in-service and on-the job orientational pursuits, we shall be able to discern our goals and methods with greater clarity. Then we shall know whither we are going. We may be headed towards the promised land. Who knows? Perhaps none of us; yet all of us do care.